

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 49 are now amended.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62, under U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Zuk et al (US Patent Publication No. 20030154399 A1), referred herein after as 'Zuk', in light of Singh, US Patent Application No. 10/656,440.

Examiner admits, page 3 four lines from end, that

"Zuk does not disclose the canonical representation of the information explicitly as claimed".

Instead the Examiner relies for this feature on Singh paragraphs 6 -7.

However Singh was filed September 5, 2003, subsequent to the provisional application from which the present application claims priority.

Singh itself claims priority from US Provisional Patent Application No. 60/416,306 – hereinafter Singh provisional. Although this document amounts to some 122 pages, the passage referred to absolutely does not appear. Instead this provisional appears to be made up of computer program documentation and simply does not include the background discussion in Singh.

Therefore, as Singh provisional does not mention canonical representation, and the provisional of the present application does, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 1 due to lack of inventive step is overcome.

Even if this is wrong, it is respectfully submitted that Singh merely teaches a way of writing documents using canonical form. There is no teaching to take known information phrases, reduce them to canonical form, and then compare them with incoming data sequences to find out if the information is present, contrary to the requirements of present claim 1.

Furthermore the Examiner's suggestions regarding the presence of claimed features in Zuk is also challenged.

The Examiner alleges that paragraphs 4 and 9 of Zuk teach transforming information items from a first format into a canonical format in accordance with a transformation format. However paragraph 4 merely states that packet headers conform to a set of shared protocols, and does not teach transforming, certainly not into a canonical format.

Paragraph 9 merely teaches translating of source addresses to different source addresses. However as is well known to the skilled person, all IP addresses are in a single format, so there is no question of a first format and a canonical format. Furthermore contrary to the requirement of the claim, the whole point of paragraph 9 is that the information (of the original address) is lost, whereas the claim requires that information is preserved.

The Examiner alleges that paragraph 10 teaches that the translation between a first format and a second format preserves meaning. However paragraph 10 merely talks about being able to distinguish between a harmless and a harmful packet and absolutely does not relate to preservation of meaning following a transformation, certainly not a transformation from a first format into a canonical format. Applicant is at a loss to determine the Examiner's intent here and would be grateful for enlightenment.

#### Conclusion regarding claim 1

Paragraphs 6 and 7 of Singh are not citable against the present claims since they were not present in Singh provisional. Claim 1 is allowable for this reason alone.

However even if they were citable, they do not teach the claimed features against which they are cited. Claim 1 is allowable for this reason alone.

But in any event, Zuk does not teach the remaining features of the claim. Claim 1 is allowable for this reason alone.

Independent claim 49 is believed to be allowable for each of the same three reasons each taken alone. Again Singh paragraphs 6 and 7 are not citable for the reasons given in the remarks regarding claim 1. Even if they were citable they do not teach the claimed features, again for the reasons given above. But in any event Zuk does not teach the remaining features of the claims, and canonical form does not appear in any citable sections of the prior art.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on allowable main claims.

The remaining claims mentioned in this section of the Office Action are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable main claim.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable.

An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan

Registration No. 40,338

Date: March 3, 2008

**Encls:**

- Petition for Extension of Time for One Month
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)